arXiv:math/0603595v1 [math.AP] 27 Mar 2006

LOW REGULARITY GLOBAL WELL-POSEDNESS FOR THE ZAKHAROV AND KLEIN-GORDON-SCHRÖDINGER SYSTEMS

JAMES COLLIANDER, JUSTIN HOLMER, AND NIKOLAOS TZIRAKIS

Abstract. We prove low-regularity global well-posedness for the 1d Zakharov system and 3d Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system, which are systems in two variables $u : \mathbb{R}^d_x \times \mathbb{R}_t \to \mathbb{C}$ and $n : \mathbb{R}^d_x \times \mathbb{R}_t \to \mathbb{R}$. The Zakharov system is known to be locally well-posed in $(u,n) \in L^2 \times H^{-1/2}$ and the Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system is known to be locally well-posed in $(u,n) \in L^2 \times L^2$. Here, we show that the Zakharov and Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger systems are globally well-posed in these spaces, respectively, by using an available conservation law for the L^2 norm of u and controlling the growth of n via the estimates in the local theory.

1. Introduction

The initial-value problem for the one-dimensional Zakharov system is

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = nu \\ \partial_t^2 n - \partial_x^2 n = \partial_x^2 |u|^2 \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x),\ n(x,0) = n_0(x),\ \partial_t n(x,0) = n_1(x). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here $u : [0,T^*) \times \mathbb{R} \longmapsto \mathbb{R}, n : [0,T^*) \times \mathbb{R} \longmapsto \mathbb{R}$. This problem arises in plasma physics. Sufficiently regular solutions of (1.1) satisfy conservation of mass

$$M[u](t) = \int |u(t)|^2\,dx = \int |u_0|^2\,dx = M[u_0] \tag{1.2}$$

and conservation of the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H[u,n,\nu](t) &= \int \left(|\partial_x u(t)|^2 + \tfrac{1}{2} n(t)^2 + n(t)|u(t)|^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\nu(t)^2 \right) dx \\ &= H[u_0, n_0, \nu_0] \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

where $\nu(t)$ is such that $\partial_t n = \partial_x \nu$ and $\partial_t \nu = \partial_x(n + |u|^2)$.

The local-in-time theory in $X_{s,b}$ spaces has been established in [3], [10], the latter paper obtaining local well-posedness (LWP) for the one-dimensional equation (1.1) with $(u_0, n_0, n_1) \in L^2 \times H^{-1/2} \times H^{-3/2}$ and for some more regular spaces $H^k \times H^s \times H^{s-1}$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q55.

Key words and phrases. Zakharov system, Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system, global well-posedness.

J.C. is partially supported by N.S.E.R.C. Grant RGPIN 250233-03 and the Sloan Foundation.

J.H. is supported by an NSF postdoctoral fellowship.

with various[1] k, s. As an immediate consequence of the local theory and (1.2),(1.3), one has global well-posedness (GWP) for $k = 1$, $s = 0$. Pecher [15], using the low-high frequency decomposition method of Bourgain [5], proved GWP for $\frac{9}{10} < k < 1$, $s = 0$. This result was improved in [17] using the I-method of [7] to obtain GWP for[2] $\frac{5}{6} < k < 1$, $s = k - 1$. The preceding GWP results are all based on the conservation of the Hamiltonian (1.3) or certain variants of the Hamiltonian. In this paper, we prove GWP for $k = 0$, $s = -\frac{1}{2}$, using a scheme based on mass conservation (1.2) and subcritical slack in certain multilinear estimates at this regularity threshold. In [11], it is shown that the one-dimensional LWP theory of [10] is effectively sharp by adapting techniques of [4] and [6]. Thus, we establish GWP in the largest space for which LWP holds.

Theorem 1.1. *The Zakharov system* (1.1) *is globally well-posed for* $(u_0, n_0, n_1) \in L^2 \times H^{-1/2} \times H^{-3/2}$ *and the solution* (u, n) *satisfies* (1.2) *and*

$$\|n(t)\|_{H_x^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\partial_t n(t)\|_{H_x^{-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \exp(c|t|\,\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2)\max(\|n_0\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|n_1\|_{H^{-\frac{3}{2}}}\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2)$$

Remark 1.2. *Since Theorem 1.1 is based on the mass conservation property* (1.2) *and the local theory, the same result applies to certain Hamiltonian generalizations of* (1.1) *for which global well-posedness was previously unknown. Indeed, if we write*

$$H[u,n,\nu](t) = \int |\partial_x u(t)|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}|n(t)|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}|\nu(t)|^2 + \gamma n(t)|u(t)|^2 dx$$

and calculate

$$\partial_t \begin{bmatrix} u \\ n \\ \nu \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \nabla\cdot \\ 0 & \nabla & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H_{\overline{u}} \\ H_n \\ H_\nu \end{bmatrix}$$

we find the evolution system

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = \gamma n u \\ \partial_t^2 n - \alpha\beta\partial_x^2 n = \beta\gamma\partial_x^2|u|^2. \end{cases}$$

If we then choose $\alpha = \beta = -1$ *and* $\gamma = -1$, *we encounter a Hamiltonian evolution problem similar to* (1.1) *but with* $+nu$ *replaced by* $-nu$. *The local theory for these problems coincides but the appearance of* $\alpha = \beta = -1$ *in the Hamiltonian* H *precludes its use in obtaining a globalizing estimate.*

---

[1] The paper [10] actually gives a systematic treatment of LWP for higher dimensional versions of (1.1) as well. Their result in dimension one uses the calculus techniques for obtaining $X_{s,b}$ bilinear estimates developed by Kenig, Ponce and Vega [13], [14]. The only LWP result in [10] when $k = 0$ is for dimension one, $s = -\frac{1}{2}$, and thus we have restricted exclusively to this case.

[2] Although the additional assumption $n_1 \in \dot{H}^{-1}$ appears in the papers [15] and [17], it can likely be removed by introducing suitable low frequency modifications to the energy identity; see [9] Lemma A.1 p. 358.

The initial-value problem for the d-dimensional Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system with Yukawa coupling is

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u = -\gamma n u & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in \mathbb{R} \\ \partial_t^2 n + \alpha\beta(1-\Delta)n = -\beta\gamma|u|^2 & \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x),\ n(x,0) = n_0(x),\ \partial_t n(x,0) = n_1(x). & \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

Here α, β, γ are real constants. The solution satisfies conservation of mass

$$M[u](t) = \int |u(t)|^2\,dx = \int |u_0|^2\,dx = M[u_0] \tag{1.5}$$

and conservation of the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H[u,n,\nu](t) &= \int \left(|\nabla u(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta}|\partial_t n(t)|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}|\sqrt{-\Delta+1}\; n(t)|^2 + \gamma n(t)|u(t)|^2 \right) dx \\ &= H[u_0, n_0, \nu_0]. \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

Pecher [16] proved that (1.4) is LWP for $d = 3$ in $L^2 \times L^2 \times H^{-1}$ and some more regular spaces $H^k \times H^s \times H^{s-1}$ for various k, s by following the scheme developed for the Zakharov system in [10]. Provided that $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, energy conservation (1.6) yields GWP in the setting $1 \le d \le 3$ and $k = 1$, $s = 1$. In the case when $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ where the energy gives control on the H^1 norm, the low-high frequency separation method of Bourgain [5] has been applied to (1.4) in [16] and the method of almost conservation laws of [7] has been applied to (1.4) in [21], to obtain GWP under the following assumptions: for $d = 1$, $k = s$, $s > \frac{1}{2}$; for $d = 2$, $k = s$, $s > \frac{\sqrt{17}-3}{2}$; for $d = 3$, $k = s$, $s > \frac{7}{10}$; for $d = 3$, $k, s > \frac{7}{10}$, $k + s > \frac{3}{2}$. Moreover, in each of these cases, a polynomial in time bound is obtained for the growth of the norms. In this paper, we prove GWP for $d = 3$, $k = s = 0$, by a scheme involving (1.5) and direct application of the Strichartz estimates for the Schrödinger operator and Minkowski's integral inequality applied to the Klein-Gordon Duhamel term.[3]

Theorem 1.3. *The Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system* (1.4) *in dimension* $d = 3$ *is globally well-posed for* $(u_0, n_0, n_1) \in L^2 \times L^2 \times H^{-1}$. *Moreover, the solution* (u, n) *satisfies* (1.5) *and*

$$\|n(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t n(t)\|_{H^{-1}} \le \exp(c|t|\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2) \max((\|n_0\|_{L^2} + \|n_1\|_{H^{-1}}), \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2). \tag{1.7}$$

Remark 1.4. *In the case where* $\alpha < 0$ *and* $\beta < 0$, *global well-posedness of* (1.4) *for large smooth data was previously unknown. Since our proof of Theorem 1.3 is based on the conservation of* $\|u(t)\|_{L^2}$, *we do not require any Sobolev norm control obtained from the Hamiltonian and obtain global well-posedness for this case as well.*

---

[3] Similar results hold for $d = 1$, $d = 2$, although for expositional convenience, we have restricted to the most delicate case $d = 3$.

The proof of both Theorem 1.1 and 1.3 apply essentially the same scheme, although invoke a different space-time norm in the local theory estimates.

1.1. **Outline of method.** We describe the globalization scheme for the Zakharov system and the Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system using the abstract initial value problem posed at some time $t = T_j$

$$\begin{cases} Ku = F(u,n) \\ Ln = G(u) \\ (u,n)(T_j) = (u_j, n_j). \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

Here K and L are linear differential operators of evolution type, F is a nonlinear term coupling the two equations together and G is a nonlinear term depending only upon u. The fact that G does not depend upon n is used in our scheme. Let $W(t)n_0$ denote the linear group $W(t)$ applied to initial data n_0 solving the initial value problem $Ln = 0, n(0) = n_0$. Similarly, let $S(t)u_0$ denote the solution of $Ku = 0, u(0) = u_0$. We denote with $Wn_0 + L^{-1}g$ the solution of the linear initial value problem $Lu = g, n(0) = n_0$. Similarly, $Su_0 + K^{-1}g$ denotes the solution of $Ku = g, u(0) = u_0$.

We solve the second equation in our system to define n in terms of the initial data n_j and u

$$n = Wn_j + L^{-1}G(u) \tag{1.9}$$

and insert the result into the solution formula for u to obtain an integrodifferential equation for u

$$u = Su_j + K^{-1}F(u, Wn_j + L^{-1}G(u)). \tag{1.10}$$

Local well-posedness for problems of the form (1.8) often follows from a fixed point argument applied to (1.10). The fixed point analysis is carried out in a Banach space $X_{[T_j,T_{j-1}]}$ of functions defined on the spacetime slab $[T_j, T_{j+1}] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. The initial data are considered in function spaces having the unitarity property with respect to the linear solution maps

$$\|W(t)n_0\|_{\mathcal{W}} = \|n_0\|_{\mathcal{W}}, \ \|S(t)u_0\|_{\mathcal{S}} = \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{S}}, \ \forall\ t, \tag{1.11}$$

and $X_{[T_j,T_{j+1}]} \subset C([T_j, T_{j+1}]; \mathcal{S})$. For the applications we have in mind, the length of the time interval $\Delta_j := |[T_j, T_{j+1}]|$ is chosen to be small enough to prove a contraction estimate and the smallness condition is of the form

$$\Delta_j \leq \min(\|u_j\|_{\mathcal{S}}^{-\gamma}, \|n_j\|_{\mathcal{W}}^{-\beta})$$

for certain $\gamma, \beta > 0$.

Suppose that $\|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{S}} = \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{S}}$ for all times t where solutions of (1.8) are well defined. If we iterate the local well-posedness argument, we will have successive time intervals $[T_j, T_{j+1}]$ with uniformly lower bounded lengths unless $\|n_j\|_{\mathcal{W}}$ grows without bound as we increase j. Suppose then at some time T_j we have $\|n_j\|_{\mathcal{W}} \gg \|u_j\|_{\mathcal{S}}^{\gamma/\beta}$ so that $\Delta_j = \|n_j\|_{\mathcal{W}}^{-\beta}$.

Since we have that (1.9) and (1.11) hold, any growth in $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$ as t moves through the time interval $[T_j, T_{j+1}]$ is due to the nonlinear influence of u upon n through the term $L^{-1}G(u)$. Therefore, an estimate of the form

$$\|L^{-1}G(u)\|_{L^\infty_{[T_j,T_{j+1}]}\mathcal{W}} \leq \Delta_j^\delta \widetilde{G}(\|u\|_{L^\infty_{[T_j,T_{j+1}]}\mathcal{S}}) \ll \|n_j\|_{\mathcal{W}} \tag{1.12}$$

permits an iteration of the local theory. Observe that the appearance of the conserved $\mathcal{S}$ norm of u in this step suggests that we should retain this smallness property of the $\mathcal{W}$ increment of n over $[T_j, T_{j+1}]$ uniformly with respect to j. We then iterate the local well-posedness argument

$$m = O\left(\frac{\|n_j\|_{\mathcal{W}}}{\Delta^\delta \widetilde{G}(\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{S}})}\right)$$

times with time steps of uniform size $\Delta = (2\|n_j\|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-\beta}$. This extends the solution to the time interval $[T_j, T_j + m\Delta]$ with

$$m\Delta = C(\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{S}})\|n_j\|_{\mathcal{W}}^{1-\beta+\delta\beta}.$$

If $1-\beta+\delta\beta \geq 0$, the scheme progresses to give global well-posedness for (1.8).

Implementing this abstract scheme for specific systems requires a quantification of the parameters β and δ using the local-in-time theory for the system. Notice that one way to force $1-\beta+\delta\beta \geq 0$ is by demanding $\beta \leq 1$. But β is always bigger than 1. Still $1-\beta+\delta\beta \geq 0$ can be greater or equal to zero because of the contribution of $\delta\beta$ term for certain $\beta > 1$ and $\delta > 0$. Calculations are required to obtain the parameters β, δ in any particular system. Unfortunately, we will often find that δ is very close to zero. Thus the condition that $1-\beta-\delta\beta \geq 0$ fails to hold for many physical systems. Nevertheless for the Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system the local well-posedness theory that we develop using the Strichartz's norms is sufficient for the above condition to hold. In particular we have that $\beta = 4$ and $\delta = \frac{3}{4}$ (see the proof of Theorem 1.3) and thus $1-\beta+\delta\beta = 0$. This approach cannot be used for the Zakharov system. The main reason is that the nonlinearity $G(u)$ has two derivatives (see equation (1.1)) and the local estimates are not as generous. The idea now is to perform the contraction argument for (1.10) in a ball

$$B_{X_{[T'_j,T'_{j+1}]}} = \left\{u : \|u\|_{X_{[T'_j,T'_{j+1}]}} \leq (\Delta'_j)^\alpha \|u_0\|_{L^2}\right\}$$

where $\Delta'_j = |[T'_j, T'_{j+1}]|$. This idea is implemented here through the use of the $X^{s,b}$ spaces with $b < 1/2$. An easy consequence of this new iteration is that the local time interval Δ'_j is larger or in other words (since $\Delta' < 1$) β is smaller. In addition when we calculate the growth of the $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$ norm, it takes more time for this norm to double in size. In other words the new δ' is bigger. Thus since $m' > m$ and $\Delta' > \Delta$ we have a better chance to meet the requirement of

$$m\Delta \gtrsim 1 \iff 1 - \beta + \delta\beta \geq 0.$$

The details are explained in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Remark 1.5. *The abstract scheme described above can be applied to other evolution systems that have common features with systems* (1.1) *and* (1.4)*. In particular, the scheme requires a satisfactory local well-posedness theory in a Banach space that embeds in* $C([T_j, T_{j+1}]; \mathcal{S})$*, with* $\|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{S}} = \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{S}}$ *holding true, and that the nonlinear term of the second equation is independent of* n*. As examples we mention the following systems.*

The initial-value problem for the coupled Schrödinger-Airy equation

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = \alpha u n + \beta |u|^2 u & x \in \mathbb{R}, t \in \mathbb{R} \\ \partial_t n + \partial_x^3 n = \gamma \partial_x |u|^2 \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x),\ n(x,0) = n_0(x) \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

This system arises in the theory of capillary-gravity waves. The local well-posedness theory has been successively sharpened in [1], [2], [8]*, the last paper establishing local well-posedness for* $(u_0, n_0) \in L^2 \times H^s$ *for* $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{1}{2}$*, and in some more regular spaces. In* [19]*, Pecher proved global well-posedness using* I*-method techniques for the harder Schrödinger-KdV system where the left hand side of the second equation of* (1.13) *includes* $n\partial_x n$*, with* $(u_0, n_0) \in H^s \times H^s$ *and* $s > \frac{3}{5}$ *when* $\beta = 0$*, and also for* $s > \frac{2}{3}$ *when* $\beta \neq 0$ *by dropping down from the* $s = 1$ *setting in which conservation of energy yields global well-posedness.*

Our scheme also applies to the Schrödinger-Benjamin-Ono system

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = \alpha u n & x \in \mathbb{R}, t \in \mathbb{R} \\ \partial_t n + \nu \partial_x |\partial_x| n = \beta \partial_x |u|^2 \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x),\ n(x,0) = n_0(x) \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

with $\alpha, \beta, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$*. This system has been studied in* [2] *where local well-posedness for* $u_0 \in H^s$ *and* $n_0 \in H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}$*, with* $s \geq 0$ *and* $|\nu| \neq 1$ *is established. In particular it is locally well-posed for* $(u_0, n_0) \in L^2 \times H^{-1/2}$*. Pecher proved* [18] *global well-posedness for* $s > 1/3$ *under the parameter constraints* $\nu > 0$*,* $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} < 0$ *and also proved local well-posedness without the restriction* $|\nu| \neq 1$ *but only for* $s > 0$*. In a forthcoming paper, we establish global well-posedness results for* (1.13) *and* (1.14) *with* $|\nu| \neq 1$ *for* $(u_0, n_0) \in L^2 \times H^{-1/2}$.

2. BASIC ESTIMATES FOR THE GROUP AND DUHAMEL TERMS

Let $U(t) = e^{it\Delta}$ denote the free linear Schrödinger group. For the 1d wave equation, it is convenient to factor the wave operator $\partial_t^2 - \partial_x^2 = (\partial_t - \partial_x)(\partial_t + \partial_x)$, and work with "reduced" components, as was done in [10]. Low frequencies in the time-derivative initial data create some minor difficulties, which we address in a manner slightly different than was done in [10]. Consider an initial data pair (n_0, n_1), and we look to solve $(\partial_t^2 - \partial_x^2)n = 0$ such that $n(0) = n_0$, $\partial_t n(0) = n_1$. Split $n_1 = n_{1L} + n_{1H}$ into low and high frequencies, and set $\hat{\nu}(\xi) = \frac{\hat{n}_{1H}(\xi)}{i\xi}$, so that $\partial_x \nu = n_{1H}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} W_+(n_0,n_1)(t,x) &= \tfrac{1}{2}n_0(x-t) - \tfrac{1}{2}\nu(x-t) + \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{x-t}^{x} n_{1L}(y)\,dy \\ W_-(n_0,n_1)(t,x) &= \tfrac{1}{2}n_0(x+t) + \tfrac{1}{2}\nu(x+t) + \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{x}^{x+t} n_{1L}(y)\,dy \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t \pm \partial_x)W_\pm(n_0,n_1)(t,x) &= \tfrac{1}{2}n_{1L}(x) \\ W_\pm(n_0,n_1)(x,0) &= \tfrac{1}{2}n_0(x) \mp \tfrac{1}{2}\nu(x) \\ \partial_t W_\pm(n_0,n_1)(x,0) &= \mp\tfrac{1}{2}\partial_x n_0(x) + \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_x\nu(x) + \tfrac{1}{2}n_{1L}(x) \end{aligned}$$

and thus $n = W_+(n_0,n_1) + W_-(n_0,n_1)$ has the desired properties. We shall also use the notation $W(n_0,n_1) = W_+(n_0,n_1) + W_-(n_0,n_1)$. Let

$$G(t)(n_0,n_1) = \cos[t(I-\Delta)^{1/2}]n_0 + \frac{\sin[t(I-\Delta)^{1/2}]}{(I-\Delta)^{1/2}}n_1$$

be the free linear Klein-Gordon group, so that $(\partial_t^2 + (1-\Delta))G(t)(n_0,n_1) = 0$, $G(0)(n_0,n_1) = n_0$, $\partial_t G(0)(n_0,n_1) = n_1$. Since our analysis involves tracking quantities whose size *increments*, rather than *doubles*, from one step to the next, it is imperative that we be precise about the definition of the following Sobolev norms. When we write the norm H^s, we shall mean exactly

$$\|f\|_{H^s} = \left(\int_\xi (1+|\xi|^2)^s |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2\,d\xi\right)^{1/2}.$$

Define the norm

$$\|f\|_{A^s} = \left(\int_{|\xi|\le 1} |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2\,d\xi + \int_{|\xi|\ge 1} |\xi|^{2s}|\hat{f}(\xi)|^2\,d\xi\right)^{1/2}$$

Of course, $\|f\|_{A^s} \sim \|f\|_{H^s}$. Let

$$\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{W}} = \left(\|n_0\|^2_{A_x^{-1/2}} + \|n_1\|^2_{A_x^{-3/2}}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{2.2}$$

When working with a function of t, we use the shorthand $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{W}} = \|(n(t), \partial_t n(t))\|_{\mathcal{W}}$. In our treatment of the Zakharov system, we shall track the size of the wave component $n(t)$ in the above norm. Let

$$\|(n_0, n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}} = \left(\|n_0\|_{L^2_x}^2 + \|n_1\|_{H^{-1}_x}^2 \right)^{1/2} . \tag{2.3}$$

Again, for functions of t, we use the shorthand $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{G}} = \|(n(t), \partial_t n(t))\|_{\mathcal{G}}$. In our treatment of the Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system, we shall track the size of the wave component $n(t)$ in the above norm.

In our treatment of the Zakharov system, we shall need to work in the Bourgain spaces. We define the Schrödinger-Bourgain space $X^S_{0,\alpha}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, by the norm

$$\|z\|_{X^S_{0,\alpha}} = \left(\iint_{\xi,\tau} \langle \tau + |\xi|^2 \rangle^{2\alpha} |\hat{z}(\xi,\tau)|^2 \, d\xi \, d\tau \right)^{1/2} ,$$

and the one-dimensional reduced-wave-Bourgain spaces $X^{W\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},\alpha}$, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, as

$$\|z\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},\alpha}} = \left(\iint_{\xi,\tau} \langle \xi \rangle^{-1} \langle \tau \pm \xi \rangle^{2\alpha} |\hat{z}(\xi,\tau)|^2 \, d\xi \, d\tau \right)^{1/2} .$$

Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\psi(t) = 1$ on $[-1,1]$ and $\psi(t) = 0$ outside of $[-2,2]$. Let $\psi_T(t) = \psi(t/T)$, which will serve as a time cutoff for the Bourgain space estimates. For clarity, we write $\psi_1(t) = \psi(t)$. The following two lemmas are standard in the subject, although we are focusing attention particularly on the exponent of T in these estimates.

Lemma 2.1 (Group estimates)**.** *Suppose $T \le 1$.*

(a) Schrödinger. $\|U(t)u_0\|_{C(\mathbb{R}_t; L^2_x)} = \|u_0\|_{L^2_x}$.
If $0 \le b_1 \le \frac{1}{2}$, then $\|\psi_T(t)U(t)u_0\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}} \lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-b_1}\|u_0\|_{L^2}$.
(Strichartz Estimates). *If $2 \le q \le \infty$, $2 \le r \le \infty$, $\frac{2}{q} + \frac{d}{r} = \frac{d}{2}$, excluding the case $d = 2$, $q = 2$, $r = \infty$, then* $\|U(t)u_0\|_{L^q_t L^r_x} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^2}$

(b) 1-d Wave. $\|W(t)(n_0,n_1)\|_{C([0,T];\mathcal{W}_x)} \le (1+T)\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$.
If $0 \le b \le \frac{1}{2}$, $\|\psi_T(t)W_\pm(t)(n_0,n_1)\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},b}} \lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-b}\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$.

(c) Klein-Gordon. $\|G(t)(n_0,n_1)\|_{C(\mathbb{R}_t;\mathcal{G}_x)} = \|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Remark 2.2. *It is important that the first estimate in* (b) *and the identity in* (c) *do not have implicit constant multiples on the right-hand side, as these estimates will be used to deduce almost conservation laws. The $(1+T)$ prefactor in the first estimate of* (b) *arises from the low frequency terms. Had we made the assumption that $n_1 \in \dot{H}^{-1}$, this term could be removed and the norm $\mathcal{W}$ redefined so that equality is obtained. The $(1+T)$ prefactor will not cause trouble in our iteration since T will be selected so that $T\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$ functions as an increment whose size is on par with the increment arising from the Duhamel terms (see the proof of Theorem 1.1 for details).*

Proof. The Strichartz estimates quoted in (a) were established in [20] (for a more recent reference, see [12]). The first assertion in (a) is immediate by Plancherel's theorem. For the second assertion in (a), we note that $[\psi_T(t)U(t)u_0]\widehat{\ }(\xi,\tau) = (\psi_T)\widehat{\ }(\tau+\xi^2)\hat{u}_0(\xi)$, and consequently

$$\|\psi_T(t)U(t)u_0\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}} \leq c\|\psi_T\|_{H^{b_1}}\|u_0\|_{L^2}$$

To complete the proof of the estimate, we note that

$$\|\psi_T\|_{H^{b_1}} \leq \|\psi_T\|_{L^2} + \|\psi_T\|_{\dot{H}^{b_1}} = T^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\psi_1\|_{L^2} + T^{\frac{1}{2}-b_1}\|\psi_1\|_{\dot{H}^{b_1}}$$

by scaling.

For the first assertion in (b), let $f(x,t)$ solve the linear wave equation

$$\partial_t^2 f - \partial_x^2 f = 0 \tag{2.4}$$

with initial data $f(x,0) = n_0(x)$, $\partial_t f(x,0) = n_1(x)$. Let P_H be the projection onto frequencies $|\xi| \geq 1$, and P_L be the projection onto frequencies $|\xi| \leq 1$. Let $D^{-3/2}$ be the multiplier operator with symbol $|\xi|^{-3/2}$. By applying $D^{-3/2}P_H$ to (2.4), multiplying by $D^{-3/2}P_H\partial_t f$ and integrating in x, we obtain the conservation identity

$$\|P_H f(T)\|^2_{A_x^{-1/2}} + \|\partial_t P_H f(T)\|^2_{A_x^{-3/2}} = \|P_H n_0\|^2_{A^{-1/2}} + \|P_H n_1\|^2_{A^{-3/2}}. \tag{2.5}$$

To obtain low frequency estimates, we work directly from the explicit formula

$$f(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2}n_0(x+t) + \tfrac{1}{2}n_0(x-t) + \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{x-t}^{x+t} n_1(y)\,dy. \tag{2.6}$$

By applying P_L and then directly estimating, we obtain

$$\|P_L f(T)\|_{L^2_x} \leq \|P_L n_0\|_{L^2} + T\|P_L n_1\|_{L^2}. \tag{2.7}$$

After applying ∂_t to (2.6), it can be rewritten as

$$\partial_t f(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{x-t}^{x+t} \partial^2 n_0(y)\,dy + \tfrac{1}{2}n_1(x+t) + \tfrac{1}{2}n_1(x-t).$$

Applying P_L and then directly estimating, we obtain

$$\|P_L\partial_t f(T)\|_{L^2_x} \leq T\|P_L n_0\|_{L^2} + \|P_L n_1\|_{L^2} \tag{2.8}$$

Combining (2.5), (2.7), and (2.8), we obtain the claim.

The second part of (b) is proved similarly to the second part of (a).

For (c), let $f(t,x)$ solve

$$\partial_t^2 f - \Delta f + f = 0 \tag{2.9}$$

with initial data $(f(0), \partial_t f(0)) = (n_0, n_1)$. Let E be the multiplier operator with symbol $(1+|\xi|^2)^{-1/2}$. Apply E to (2.9), then multiply by $\partial_t Ef$, and finally integrate in x to obtain the asserted conservation law. □

Let

$$U *_R z(t,x) = \int_0^t U(t-t')z(t',x)\,dt'$$

denote the Duhamel operator corresponding to the Schrödinger operator, so that $(i\partial_t + \Delta)U *_R z(t,x) = iz(t,x)$, $U *_R z(0,x) = 0$. Let

$$W_\pm *_R z(t,x) = \tfrac{1}{2}\int_0^t z(t-s, x \mp s)ds$$

so that

$$\begin{gathered}(\partial_t \pm \partial_x)W_\pm *_R z(t,x) = \tfrac{1}{2}z(t,x)\\ W_\pm *_R z(0,x) = 0, \quad \partial_t W_\pm *_R z(0,x) = \tfrac{1}{2}z(0,x).\end{gathered}$$

It follows that if we set $n = W_+ *_R z - W_- *_R z$, then $(\partial_t^2 - \partial_x^2)n = \partial_x z$ and $n(0,x) = 0$, $\partial_t n(0,x) = 0$, so we define

$$W *_R z = W_+ *_R z - W_- *_R z. \tag{2.10}$$

For the Klein-Gordon equation, let

$$G *_R z(t,x) = \int_0^t \frac{\sin[(t-t')(I-\Delta)^{1/2}]}{(I-\Delta)^{1/2}} z(t',x)\,dt'$$

so that $(\partial_t^2 + (I-\Delta))G *_R z = z$, $G *_R z(0,x) = 0$, $\partial_t G *_R z(0,x) = 0$.

Lemma 2.3 (Duhamel estimates)**.** *Suppose* $T \le 1$.

(a) Schrödinger. *If* $0 \le c_1 < \frac{1}{2}$*, then* $\|U *_R z\|_{C([0,T];L^2_x)} \lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-c_1}\|z\|_{X^S_{0,-c_1}}$.
If $0 \le c_1 < \frac{1}{2}$, $0 \le b_1$, $b_1 + c_1 \le 1$, *then* $\|\psi_T U *_R z\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}} \lesssim T^{1-b_1-c_1}\|z\|_{X^S_{0,-c_1}}$.
(Strichartz Estimates). *If* $2 \le q \le \infty$, $2 \le r \le \infty$, $\frac{2}{q} + \frac{d}{r} = \frac{d}{2}$ *excluding the case* $d = 2$, $q = 2$, $r = \infty$, *and similarly for* $\tilde q$, $\tilde r$, *then* $\|U *_R z\|_{C([0,T];L^2_x)} + \|U *_R z\|_{L^q_{[0,T]}L^r_x} \lesssim \|z\|_{L^{\tilde q'}_{[0,T]}L^{\tilde r'}_x}$, *where* $'$ *indicates the Hölder dual exponent* ($\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$).

(b) 1-d Wave. *If* $0 \le c < \frac{1}{2}$*, then* $\|W *_R z\|_{C([0,T];\mathcal{W}_x)} \lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-c}\|z\|_{X^{W_\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},-c}}$.
If $0 \le c < \frac{1}{2}$, $0 \le b$, $b + c \le 1$, *then* $\|\psi_T W_\pm *_R z\|_{X^{W_\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},b}} \lesssim T^{1-b-c}\|z\|_{X^{W_\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},-c}}$.

(c) Klein-Gordon. $\|G *_R z\|_{C([0,T];\mathcal{G}_x)} \lesssim \|z\|_{L^1_{[0,T]}H^{-1}_x}$.

Proof. The second assertion in each of (a) and (b) is [10] Lemma 2.1(ii). For the Stricharz estimates quoted in (a), see [20][12]. We next establish the first part of (a). We begin by establishing the bound

$$\|\psi_T(t)U *_R z(x,t)\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \le cT^{\frac{1}{2}-c_1}\|f\|_{X^S_{0,-c_1}}. \tag{2.11}$$

Let $f_\xi(t) = e^{it\xi^2}\hat{z}(\xi,t)$, where $\hat{}$ denotes the Fourier transform in the x-variable only. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\psi_T(t)U *_R z(x,t)\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \\
&\quad = \left\|\psi_T(t)\int_0^t f_\xi(t')dt'\right\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_\xi} \\
&\quad \le \left\|\psi_T(t)\int_0^t f_\xi(t')dt'\right\|_{L^2_\xi L^\infty_t}. \qquad (2.12)
\end{aligned}$$

Below we shall show that for a function $f(t)$ of the t-variable alone, we have the estimate

$$\left\|\psi_T(t)\int_0^t f(t')dt'\right\|_{L^\infty_t} \le cT^{\frac{1}{2}-c_1}\|f\|_{H^{-c_1}}. \qquad (2.13)$$

Assuming this, then it follows from (2.12) that

$$\|\psi_T(t)U *_R z(x,t)\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \le cT^{\frac{1}{2}-c_1}\| \, \|f_\xi\|_{H^{-c_1}_t}\|_{L^2_\xi} = cT^{\frac{1}{2}-c_1}\|f\|_{X^S_{0,-c_1}}$$

completing the proof of (2.11). Now we show (2.13). Break $f(t) = f_+(t) + f_-(t)$ where $\hat{f}_-(\tau) = \chi_{|\tau|<\frac{1}{T}}\hat{f}(\tau)$ and $\hat{f}_+(\tau) = \chi_{|\tau|>\frac{1}{T}}\hat{f}(\tau)$. Then for f_-, we have

$$\left\|\psi_T(t)\int_0^t f_-(s)\,ds\right\|_{L^\infty_t} \le T^{1/2}\|f_-\|_{L^2} \le T^{\frac{1}{2}-c_1}\|f_-\|_{H^{-c_1}}.$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t f_+(s)\,ds &= (\chi_{[-t,0]} * f_+)(0) \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int (\chi_{[-t,0]} * f_+)\widehat{\ }(\sigma)\,d\sigma \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_\sigma \frac{1-e^{-it\sigma}}{i\sigma}\hat{f}_+(\sigma)\,d\sigma
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\left[\psi_T(t)\int_0^t f_+(s)\,ds\right]\widehat{\ }(\tau) = \int_\sigma \frac{T\hat{\psi}(T(\tau-\sigma)) - T\hat{\psi}(T\tau)}{\sigma}\hat{f}_+(\sigma)\,d\sigma.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\psi_T(t)\int_0^t f_+(s)\,ds\right\|_{L_t^\infty}\\&\qquad\le \|T\hat{\psi}(T\tau)\|_{L^1_\tau}\left\|\frac{\hat{f}_+(\tau)}{\tau}\right\|_{L^1_\tau}\\&\qquad\le\left(\int_{|\tau|>\frac{1}{T}}\frac{d\tau}{|\tau|^{2-2c_1}}\right)^{1/2}\|f_+\|_{H^{-c_1}}\\&\qquad\le T^{\frac{1}{2}-c_1}\|f\|_{H^{-c_1}}\end{aligned}$$

establishing (2.13). It remains only to show continuity, i.e. that for a fixed $z\in X^S_{0,-c_1}$ and each $\epsilon>0$, there is $\delta=\delta(\epsilon,z)>0$ such that if $|t_2-t_1|<\delta$, then

$$\|\psi_T U *_R z(x,t_2)-\psi_T U *_R z(x,t_1)\|_{L^2_x}<\epsilon.$$

By an $\epsilon/3$ argument appealing to (2.11), it suffices to establish this statement for z belonging to the dense class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)\subset X^S_{0,-c_1}$. However, if $z\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we have $\partial_t(U *_R z)=z+i\Delta(U *_R z)$ and the fundamental theorem of calculus and (2.11) imply that

$$\|U *_R z(\cdot,t_2)-U *_R z(\cdot,t_1)\|_{L^2_x}\le c(t_2-t_1)(\|z\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}+\|\Delta z\|_{X^S_{0,-c_1}}).$$

The proof of the first assertion of (b) proceeds in analogy to the above proof, first establishing the bound

$$\|W_\pm *_R z\|_{L^\infty_t H_x^{-1/2}}\lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-c}\|z\|_{X^{W_\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},-c}}.$$

The continuity statement is deduced by a density argument as in the previous paragraph, and finally the bound as stated on $W *_R z$ follows by the identity

$$\partial_t W *_R z=\partial_x W_+ *_R z+\partial_x W_- *_R z.$$

The proof of (c) follows from an application of Minkowskii's integral inequality, with the continuity statement deduced by a density argument as in the previous paragraph. □

3. 1-d Zakharov system

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. We shall make use of the conservation law (1.2) to control the growth of $u(t)$ from one local time step to the next. We track the growth of $n(t)$ in the norm $\mathcal{W}$ defined in (2.2) using the estimates from the local theory. We now state the needed estimates from the local theory of [10].

Lemma 3.1 (Multilinear estimates)**.**

(a) *If* $\frac{1}{4}<b_1,c_1,b<\frac{1}{2}$ *and* $b+b_1+c_1\ge 1$, *then* $\|n_\pm u\|_{X^S_{0,-c_1}}\lesssim\|n_\pm\|_{X^{W_\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},b}}\|u\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}}$.

(b) *If* $\frac{1}{4} < b_1, c < \frac{1}{2}$ *and* $2b_1 + c \geq 1$*, then* $\|\partial_x(u_1\bar{u}_2)\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},-c}} \lesssim \|u_1\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}} \|u_2\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}}$.

We remark that we can simultaneously achieve both optimal conditions $b + b_1 + c_1 = 1$ *and* $2b_1 + c = 1$*, for example by taking all four indices* $b = b_1 = c = c_1 = \frac{1}{3}$.

Proof. (a) is the case $k = 0$, $\ell = -\frac{1}{2}$ in [10] Lemma 4.3, and (b) is the case $k = 0$, $l = -\frac{1}{2}$ in [10] Lemma 4.4. The assumptions $b + c_1 > \frac{3}{4}$, $b + b_1 > \frac{3}{4}$ for Lemma 4.3 and $b_1 + c > \frac{3}{4}$ for Lemma 4.4 that appear in [10] are not needed and we only have the requirements $b + b_1 + c_1 \geq 1$ for Lemma 4.3 and $2b_1 + c \geq 1$ for Lemma 4.4. The reason is that equation (4.30) in [10] on p. 424 is finite even if $\alpha_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ since the range of integration is finite[4] (from 0 to $\xi_1^2/4$). Because relaxing this condition is essential to our method, we have included these proofs in the appendix so that they can be examined by the reader. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As discussed above, we can reduce the wave component $n = n_+ + n_-$ and recast (1.1) as

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = (n_+ + n_-)u & x \in \mathbb{R}, t \in \mathbb{R} \\ (\partial_t \pm \partial_x)n_\pm = \pm\frac{1}{2}\partial_x|u|^2 + \frac{1}{2}n_{1L} & \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

which has the integral equation formulation

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= U(t)u_0 - iU *_R [(n_+ + n_-)u](t) \\ n_\pm(t) &= W_\pm(t)(n_0, n_1) \pm W_\pm *_R (\partial_x|u|^2)(t). \end{aligned}$$

Fix $0 < T < 1$, and consider the maps Λ_S, $\Lambda_{W\pm}$

$$\Lambda_S(u, n_\pm) = \psi_T U u_0 + \psi_T U *_R [(n_+ + n_-)u] \tag{3.2}$$

$$\Lambda_{W\pm}(u) = \psi_T W_\pm(n_0, n_1) \pm \psi_T W_\pm *_R (\partial_x|u|^2). \tag{3.3}$$

We seek a fixed point $(u(t), n_\pm(t)) = (\Lambda_S(u, n_\pm), \Lambda_{W\pm}(u))$. Estimating (3.2) in X^S_{0,b_1}, applying the first estimates in Lemma 2.1(a), 2.3(a) and following through with Lemma 3.1(a); and estimating (3.3) in $X^{W_\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},b}$, applying the first estimates in Lemma 2.1(b), 2.3(b) and following through with Lemma 3.1(b), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda_S(u, n_\pm)\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}} &\lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-b_1}\|u_0\|_{L^2} + T^{1-b_1-c_1}\|n_\pm\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},b}}\|u\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}} \\ \|\Lambda_{W\pm}(u)\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac{1}{2},b}} &\lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-b}\|(n_0, n_1)\|_{\mathcal{W}} + T^{1-b-c}\|u\|^2_{X^S_{0,b_1}} \end{aligned}$$

---

[4] This comment applies in the $k = 0$, $\ell = -\frac{1}{2}$ setting but perhaps not in the general setting in which Lemmas 4.3,4.4 are stated.

and also

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Lambda_S(u_1,n_{1\pm})-\Lambda_S(u_2,n_{2\pm})\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}}\\&\qquad\lesssim T^{1-b_1-c_1}(\|n_{1\pm}\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac12,b}}\|u_1-u_2\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}}+\|n_{1\pm}-n_{2\pm}\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac12,b}}\|u_2\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}})\\&\|\Lambda_{W\pm}(u_1)-\Lambda_{W\pm}(u_2)\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac12,b}}\lesssim T^{1-b-c}(\|u_1\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}}+\|u_2\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}})\|u_1-u_2\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}}.\end{aligned}$$

By taking T such that

$$T^{\frac32-2b_1-c_1}\|u_0\|_{L^2}\lesssim 1,\qquad T^{\frac32-b-b_1-c}\|u_0\|_{L^2}\lesssim 1$$

$$T^{\frac32-b-b_1-c_1}\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W}\lesssim 1 \tag{3.4}$$

$$T^{\frac32-2b_1-c}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2}\lesssim \|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W} \tag{3.5}$$

one obtains sufficient conditions for a contraction argument yielding the existence of a fixed point $u\in X^S_{0,b_1}$, $n_\pm\in X^{W\pm}_{-\frac12,b}$ of (3.2)-(3.3) such that

$$\|u\|_{X^S_{0,b_1}}\lesssim T^{\frac12-b_1}\|u_0\|_{L^2},\qquad \|n_\pm\|_{X^{W\pm}_{-\frac12,b}}\lesssim T^{\frac12-b}\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W}. \tag{3.6}$$

Similarly estimating (3.2) in $C([0,T];L^2_x)$ by applying Lemmas 2.1(a),2.3(a) and (3.6) shows that in fact $u\in C([0,T];L^2_x)$. We may therefore invoke the conservation law (1.2) to conclude $\|u(T)\|_{L^2_x}=\|u_0\|_{L^2}$ and thus are concerned only with the possibility of growth in $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal W}$ from one time step to the next. Suppose that after some number of iterations we reach a time where $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal W}\gg\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2_x}=\|u_0\|^2_{L^2_x}$. Take this time position as the initial time $t=0$ so that $\|u_0\|^2_{L^2}\ll\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W}$. Then (3.5) is automatically satisfied and by (3.4), we may select a time increment of size

$$T\sim\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W}^{-1/(\frac32-b-b_1-c_1)}=\|(n_0,n_1)\|^{-2}_{\mathcal W} \tag{3.7}$$

where the right-hand side follows by selecting the optimal condition $b+b_1+c_1=1$ in Lemma 3.1(a). Since

$$n=W(n_0,n_1)+W*_R(\partial_x|u|^2)$$

we can apply Lemma 2.1(b), 2.3(b) and follow through with (3.6) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|n(T)\|_{\mathcal W}&\le(1+T)\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W}+CT^{\frac32-(2b_1+c)}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2}\\&\le\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W}+CT^{\frac12}(\|u_0\|^2_{L^2}+1)\end{aligned}$$

where C is some fixed constant. The second line above follows by selecting the optimal condition $2b_1+c=1$ in Lemma 3.1(b), and using (3.7) to obtain $T\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W}\le CT^{\frac12}$. From this we see that we can carry out m iterations on time intervals, each of length (3.7), where

$$m\sim\frac{\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal W}}{T^{\frac12}(\|u_0\|^2_{L^2}+1)} \tag{3.8}$$

before the quantity $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$ doubles. The total time we advance after these m iterations, by (3.7) and (3.8), is

$$mT \sim \frac{1}{\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + 1}$$

which is independent of $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$.

We can now repeat this entire procedure, each time advancing a time of length $\sim (\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + 1)^{-1}$ (independent of the size of $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$). Upon each repetition, the size of $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{W}}$ will at most double, giving the exponential-in-time upper bound stated in Theorem 1.1.

□

4. 3-d Klein-Gordon Schrödinger system

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. For the Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system (1.4), no special multilinear estimates are needed. Instead, we will work in standard space-time norms and use Sobolev imbedding and the Hölder inequality.

We shall use the conservation law (1.5) to control the growth of $u(t)$ from one time step to the next and track the growth of $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{G}}$, where the $\mathcal{G}$ norm was defined in (2.3), by direct estimation. For expositional convenience, we restrict to dimension $d = 3$ although similar results do hold for $d = 1$ and $d = 2$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. (1.4) has the integral equation formulation

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= U(t)u_0 + iU *_R [nu](t) \\ n(t) &= G(t)(n_0, n_1) + G *_R (|u|^2)(t). \end{aligned}$$

Define the maps Λ_S, Λ_G as

$$\Lambda_S(u, n) = Uu_0 + iU *_R [nu] \tag{4.1}$$

$$\Lambda_G(u) = G(n_0, n_1) + G *_R (|u|^2). \tag{4.2}$$

Let $\mathrm{Str} = L^{10/3}_{[0,T]} L^{10/3}_x \cap L^8_{[0,T]} L^{12/5}_x$. We seek a fixed point $(u(t), n(t)) = (\Lambda_S(u, n), \Lambda_G(u))$ in the space $[C([0, T]; L^2_x) \cap \mathrm{Str}] \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{G}_x)$. Apply Lemma 2.3(a) with $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{r}) = (\frac{20}{9}, 5)$ for $d = 3$ to obtain

$$\|\Lambda_S(u, n)\|_{C([0,T];L^2_x)\cap \mathrm{Str}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^2} + T^{1/4} \|n\|_{L^\infty_{[0,T]} L^2_x} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{10}{3}}_{[0,T]} L^{\frac{10}{3}}_x}.$$

Estimate (4.2) in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{G}_x)$ and apply Lemma 2.3(c) followed by Sobolev imbedding to obtain

$$\|\Lambda_G(u)\|_{C([0,T];\mathcal{G}_x)} \leq \|(n_0, n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}} + cT^{3/4} \|u\|^2_{L^8_{[0,T]} L^{12/5}_x} \tag{4.3}$$

where we estimated as: $\||u|^2\|_{L^1_{[0,T]} H^{-1}_x} \lesssim \||u|^2\|_{L^1_{[0,T]} L^{6/5}_x} \leq T^{3/4} \|u\|^2_{L^8_{[0,T]} L^{12/5}_x}$. There are similar estimates for the differences $\Lambda_S(u_1, n_1) - \Lambda_S(u_2, n_2)$ and $\Lambda_G(u_1) - \Lambda_G(u_2)$.

If T is such that

$$T^{1/4}\|u_0\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1$$

$$T^{1/4}\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim 1 \tag{4.4}$$

$$T^{3/4}\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}} \tag{4.5}$$

then a contraction argument implies there is a solution (u,n) to (1.4) on $[0,T]$ such that

$$\|u\|_{C([0,T];L^2_x)\cap \mathrm{Str}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^2} \tag{4.6}$$

$$\|n\|_{C([0,T];\mathcal{G}_x)} \le \|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}} + cT^{3/4}\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{4.7}$$

By the conservation of mass, we have $\|u(t)\|_{L^2_x} = \|u_0\|_{L^2}$, and are thus concerned only with the possibility that $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{G}}$ grows excessively from one local increment to the next. Suppose that after some number of iterations $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{G}} \gg \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2$. Consider this time as the initial time so that $\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}} \gg \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2$. Then (4.5) is automatically satisfied, and by (4.4), we may thus take

$$T \sim \|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}}^{-4}. \tag{4.8}$$

We see from (4.7) that, after m iterations, each of size (4.8), where

$$m \sim \frac{\|(n_0,n_1)\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{T^{3/4}\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2}$$

the quantity $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{G}}$ at most doubles. The total time advanced after these m iterations is

$$mT \sim \frac{1}{\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2}.$$

We can now repeat this entire procedure, each time advancing a time of length $\sim \|u_0\|_{L^2}^{-2}$ (independent of the size of $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{G}}$). Upon each repetition, the size of $\|n(t)\|_{\mathcal{G}}$ will at most double, giving the exponential-in-time upper bound stated in Theorem 1.3.

□

Appendix A. Proof of the multilinear estimates (expository)

In this section, we prove Lemma 3.1. The material here is taken from [10] Lemma 4.3, 4.4 with only a slight modification at one stage. This modification was described in a note under the heading "proof" following the statement of Lemma 3.1. Given its importance in our scheme, the full proof is included here in detail.

We need the calculus lemmas:

Lemma A.1 ([10] Lemma 4.1). *Let $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R})$, $g \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R})$ for $1 \le q, q' \le \infty$ and $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$. Assume that f, g are nonnegative, even, and nonincreasing for positive argument. Then $f * g$ enjoys the same properties.*

Define

$$[\lambda]_+ = \begin{cases} \lambda & \text{if } \lambda > 0 \\ \epsilon & \text{if } \lambda = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda < 0 \end{cases}$$

Lemma A.2 ([10] Lemma 4.2)**.** *Let* $0 \leq a_- \leq a_+$ *and* $a_+ + a_- > \frac{1}{2}$. *Then* $\forall\, s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_y \langle y - s\rangle^{-2a_+} \langle y + s\rangle^{-2a_-}\, dy \leq c\langle s\rangle^{-\alpha}$$

where $\alpha = 2a_- - [1 - 2a_+]_+$.

Proof of Lemma 3.1(a). We shall only do the + case. The estimate is equivalent to

$$|S| \leq c\|v\|_2 \|v_1\|_2 \|v_2\|_2$$

where

$$S = \int_* \frac{\hat{v}\hat{v}_1\hat{v}_2\langle\xi\rangle^{1/2}}{\langle\sigma\rangle^b \langle\sigma_1\rangle^{c_1} \langle\sigma_2\rangle^{b_1}} \tag{A.1}$$

with $\hat{v} = \hat{v}(\xi,\tau)$, $\hat{v}_1 = \hat{v}_1(\xi_1,\tau_1)$, $\hat{v}_2 = \hat{v}_2(\xi_2,\tau_2)$, $\sigma_1 = \tau_1 + \xi_1^2$, $\sigma_2 = \tau_2 + \xi_2^2$, $\sigma = \tau + \xi$, and $*$ indicates the restriction $\xi_1 = \xi + \xi_2$, $\tau_1 = \tau + \tau_2$. Indeed, for $\hat{v}_1 \in L^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\xi_1,\tau_1} \widehat{n_+ u}(\xi_1,\tau_1)\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{-c_1}\hat{v}_1(\xi_1,\tau_1)\, d\xi_1 d\tau_1 \\ &\qquad = \int_{\xi_1,\tau_1} \left[\int_{\substack{\xi_1=\xi+\xi_2 \\ \tau_1=\tau+\tau_2}} \hat{n}_+(\xi,\tau)\hat{u}(\xi_2,\tau_2)\right] \langle\sigma_1\rangle^{-c_1}\hat{v}_1(\xi_1,\tau_1) d\xi_1 d\tau_1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{v}(\xi,\tau) = \hat{n}_+(\xi,\tau)\langle\xi\rangle^{-1/2}\langle\sigma\rangle^b$ and $\hat{v}_2(\xi_2,\tau_2) = \hat{u}(\xi_2,\tau_2)\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{b_1}$ to obtain (A.1).

We note here that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 - \sigma - \sigma_2 &= \tau_1 + \xi_1^2 - (\tau + \xi) - (\tau_2 + \xi_2^2) \\ &= \xi_1^2 - \xi - \xi_2^2 \\ &= (\xi_1 - \tfrac{1}{2})^2 - (\xi_2 - \tfrac{1}{2})^2 \end{aligned}$$

In the case when $|\xi| \leq 1$, it suffices to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\xi_1,\tau_1} \int_{\substack{\xi_1=\xi+\xi_2 \\ \tau_1=\tau+\tau_2}} \frac{\hat{v}\hat{v}_1\hat{v}_2}{\langle\sigma\rangle^{1/4}\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{1/4+}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{1/4+}} \\
&\qquad = \int_{\xi_1,\tau_1} \left(\frac{\hat{v}_1}{\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{1/4+}}\right)\left(\int_{\substack{\xi_1=\xi+\xi_2 \\ \tau_1=\tau+\tau_2}} \frac{\hat{v}\hat{v}_2}{\langle\sigma\rangle^{1/4}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{1/4+}}\, d\xi_2 d\tau_2\right) d\xi_1 d\tau_1 \\
&\qquad = \int_{x_1,t_1} \left[\frac{\hat{v}_1}{\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{1/4+}}\right]^\vee \left[\int_{\substack{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2 \\ \tau=\tau_1+\tau_2}} \frac{\hat{v}\hat{v}_2}{\langle\sigma\rangle^{1/4}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{1/4+}}\, d\xi_2 d\tau_2\right]^\vee \\
&\qquad = \int_{x,t} \left[\frac{\hat{v}_1}{\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{1/4+}}\right]^\vee \left[\frac{\hat{v}}{\langle\sigma\rangle^{1/4}}\right]^\vee \left[\frac{\hat{v}_2}{\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{1/4+}}\right]^\vee \\
&\qquad \leq \left\| \left[\frac{\hat{v}_1}{\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{1/4+}}\right]^\vee \right\|_{L_t^{8/3}L_x^4} \left\| \left[\frac{\hat{v}}{\langle\sigma\rangle^{1/4}}\right]^\vee \right\|_{L_t^4L_x^2} \left\| \left[\frac{\hat{v}_2}{\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{1/4+}}\right]^\vee \right\|_{L_t^{8/3}L_x^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \left[\frac{\hat{v}}{\langle\sigma\rangle^{1/4}}\right]^\vee \right\|_{L_t^4L_x^2} &= \left\| \int_\xi e^{ix\xi} \int_\tau e^{it\tau} \frac{\hat{v}(\xi,\tau)}{\langle\tau+\xi\rangle^{1/4}}\, d\tau\, d\xi \right\|_{L_t^4L_x^2} \\
&= \left\| \int_\tau e^{it\tau} \frac{\hat{v}(\xi,\tau)}{\langle\tau+\xi\rangle^{1/4}}\, d\tau \right\|_{L_t^4L_\xi^2} \\
&\leq \left\| \int_\tau e^{it\tau} \frac{\hat{v}(\xi,\tau)}{\langle\tau+\xi\rangle^{1/4}}\, d\tau \right\|_{L_\xi^2L_t^4} \quad \text{by Minkowskii} \\
&\leq \left\| \int_\tau e^{it\tau} \frac{\hat{v}(\xi,\tau-\xi)}{\langle\tau\rangle^{1/4}}\, d\tau \right\|_{L_\xi^2L_t^4} \\
&\leq \left\| \int_\tau e^{it\tau} \hat{v}(\xi,\tau-\xi)\, d\tau \right\|_{L_\xi^2L_t^2} \quad \text{by Sobolev} \\
&= \|\hat{v}\|_{L_\xi^2L_\tau^2} = \|v\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The estimate on

$$\left\| \left[\frac{\hat{v}_2}{\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{1/4+}}\right]^\vee \right\|_{L_t^{8/3}L_x^4}$$

is obtained by interpolating halfway between $\|[\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{-d}\hat{v}_1]^\vee\|_{L_t^4L_x^\infty} \leq \|v_1\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}$ for $d > \frac{1}{2}$ (Strichartz) and $\|[\hat{v}_1]^\vee\|_{L_t^2L_x^2} = \|v_1\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}$. This leaves us to estimate

$$S' = \int_* \frac{\hat{v}\hat{v}_1\hat{v}_2|\xi|^{1/2}}{\langle\sigma\rangle^b\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{c_1}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{b_1}} \tag{A.2}$$

with $\hat{v} = \hat{v}(\xi,\tau)$, $\hat{v}_1 = \hat{v}_1(\xi_1,\tau_1)$, $\hat{v}_2 = \hat{v}_2(\xi_2,\tau_2)$, $\sigma_1 = \tau_1 + \xi_1^2$, $\sigma_2 = \tau_2 + \xi_2^2$, $\sigma = \tau + \xi$, and $*$ indicates the restriction $\xi_1 = \xi + \xi_2$, $\tau_1 = \tau + \tau_2$.

Region σ dominant, $|\sigma| \geq \max(|\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
S' &\leq \left(\int_{\xi,\sigma} |\hat{v}|^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\xi,\sigma} \langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b} \left|\int_{\xi_2,\sigma_2} \frac{|\hat{v}_1\hat{v}_2||\xi|^{1/2}}{\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{c_1}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{b_1}}\right|^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\int_{\xi,\sigma} |\hat{v}|^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\xi,\sigma} \langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b} \left(\int_{\xi_2,\sigma_2} |\hat{v}_1\hat{v}_2|^2\right)\left(\int_{\xi_2,\sigma_2} \frac{|\xi|}{\langle\sigma\rangle^{2c_1}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{2b_1}}\right)\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\sup_{\sigma,\xi}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b} \int_{\sigma_2}\int_{\xi_2} \frac{|\xi|}{\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{2c_1}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{2b_1}}\, d\xi_2 d\sigma_2\right)^{1/2} \|v\|_2\|v_1\|_2\|v_2\|_2. \qquad \text{(A.3)}
\end{aligned}
$$

The inner integral is taken over fixed σ, ξ, σ_2. Since $\xi_1 = \xi + \xi_2$, we have $d\xi_1 = d\xi_2$, and since $\sigma_1 - \sigma - \sigma_2 = (\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2$, we have

$$d\sigma_1 = [+2(\xi_1 - \tfrac{1}{2}) - 2(\xi_2 - \tfrac{1}{2})]d\xi_1 = 2\xi d\xi_2.$$

Thus, the quantity in parentheses in (A.3) is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\sigma}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b} &\int_{\sigma_2}\int_{\sigma_1} \frac{d\sigma_1 d\sigma_2}{\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{2c_1}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{2b_1}} \\
&\leq \langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b}\langle\sigma\rangle^{[1-2c_1]_+}\langle\sigma\rangle^{[1-2b_1]_+} \\
&\leq \langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b+[1-2c_1]_+ + [1-2b_1]_+}
\end{aligned}
$$

since σ is dominant. If $b, c_1, b_1 < \frac{1}{2}$, then the exponent is $2 - 2b - 2c_1 - 2b_1$, and it suffices to have $b + c_1 + b_1 \geq 1$.

Region σ_1 dominant, $|\sigma_1| \geq \max(|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|)$.

By the Cauchy-Schwarz method, it suffices to show

$$\sup_{\xi_1,\sigma_1}\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{-2c_1} \int_{\sigma_2}\int_{\xi_2} |\xi|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{-2b_1}\, d\xi_2 d\sigma_2 \qquad \text{(A.4)}$$

is finite.

Subregion $|\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2}| \leq 2|\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2}|$. Then $|\xi| \leq 3|\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2}|$. The inner integral over ξ_2 is taken with σ_1, ξ_1, σ_2 fixed. Since $\sigma_1 - \sigma - \sigma_2 = (\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2$, we have $d\sigma = 2(\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})d\xi_2$ and thus (A.4) is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\sigma_1}\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{-2c_1} &\int_{\sigma_2=0}^{|\sigma_1|}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{-2b_1} d\sigma_2 \int_{\sigma=0}^{|\sigma_1|}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b}\, d\sigma \\
&\leq \langle\sigma_1\rangle^{-2c_1+[1-2b_1]_+ + [1-2b]_+}.
\end{aligned}
$$

If $b, b_1 < \frac{1}{2}$, then the exponent here is $2-2b_1-2b-2c_1$, and thus we need $b_1+b+c_1 \geq 1$.

Subregion $|\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2}| \geq 2|\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2}|$. Since $\xi = \xi_1 - \xi_2$, we have $|\xi| \leq \frac{3}{2}|\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2}|$. Also $\frac{3}{4}(\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 \leq (\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2 = \sigma_1 - \sigma_2 - \sigma \leq 3|\sigma_1|$, and thus $(\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 \leq 4|\sigma_1|$.

Thus (A.4) is bounded by

$$\sup_{\xi_1,\sigma_1}\langle\xi_1\rangle^{1-4c_1}\int_{\sigma_2}\int_{\xi_2}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{-2b_1}\,d\xi_2\,d\sigma_2.$$

We change variables $y=(\xi_2-\frac{1}{2})^2$ to obtain

$$\sup_{\xi_1,\sigma_1}\langle\xi_1\rangle^{1-4c_1}\int_{y=-\langle\xi_1\rangle^2}^{y=\langle\xi_1\rangle^2}|y|^{-1/2}\int_{\sigma_2}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{-2b_1}\,d\sigma_2\,dy. \tag{A.5}$$

The inner integral over σ_2 is taken with fixed $y=(\xi_2-\frac{1}{2})^2$, ξ_1, σ_1, and thus $\sigma_2+\sigma=\sigma_1-(\xi_1-\frac{1}{2})^2-(\xi_2-\frac{1}{2})^2=\sigma_1-(\xi_1-\frac{1}{2})^2-y$ is fixed. By Lemma A.2,

$$\int_{\sigma_2}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{-2b_1}\,d\sigma_2\le c\langle\sigma_1-(\xi_1-\tfrac{1}{2})^2-y\rangle^{-\alpha}\qquad\text{if } b_1+b>\tfrac{1}{2}$$

where $\alpha=2b-[1-2b_1]_+$ if $b_1\ge b$ or $=2b_1-[1-2b]_+$ if $b\ge b_1$. By Lemma A.1 with $f(y)=\chi_{-\langle\xi_1\rangle^2\le y\le\langle\xi_1\rangle^2}(y)|y|^{-1/2}$ and $g(y)=\langle y\rangle^{-\alpha}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\sigma_1}&\int_{y=-\langle\xi_1\rangle^2}^{+\langle\xi_1\rangle^2}|y|^{-1/2}\langle\sigma_1-(\xi_1-\tfrac{1}{2})^2-y\rangle^{-\alpha}\,dy\\&\le\int_{y=-\langle\xi_1\rangle^2}^{+\langle\xi_1\rangle^2}|y|^{-1/2}\langle y\rangle^{-\alpha}\,dy\\&\le\langle\xi_1\rangle^{[1-2\alpha]_+}\end{aligned}$$

and hence (A.5) is controlled by

$$\sup_{\xi_1}\langle\xi_1\rangle^{1-4c_1+[1-2\alpha]_+}.$$

We now consider the exponent. Suppose $b,b_1<\frac{1}{2}$ but $b_1+b>\frac{1}{2}$. Then $\alpha=-1+2b+2b_1$.
Case 1. $\alpha>\frac{1}{2}\iff b+b_1>\frac{3}{4}$. Then we need $c_1\ge\frac{1}{4}$.
Case 2. $\alpha=\frac{1}{2}\iff b+b_1=\frac{3}{4}$. Then we need $c_1>\frac{1}{4}$.
Case 3. $\alpha<\frac{1}{2}\iff b+b_1<\frac{3}{4}$. Then the exponent is $4-4c_1-4b-4b_1$, and we need $b+b_1+c_1\ge 1$.

Region σ_2 dominant, $|\sigma_2|\ge\max(|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|)$. This is analogous to the σ_1 dominant case, but we carry it out anyway. By the Cauchy-Schwarz method, need to show

$$\sup_{\xi_2,\sigma_2}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{-2b_1}\iint_{\sigma_1,\xi_1}|\xi|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2b}\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{-2c_1}\,d\sigma_1\,d\xi_1 \tag{A.6}$$

is finite.
Subregion $|\xi_2-\frac{1}{2}|\le 2|\xi_1-\frac{1}{2}|$. Then $|\xi|\le 3|\xi_1-\frac{1}{2}|$. The inner integral over ξ_1

is taken with σ_1, ξ_2, σ_2 fixed. Since $\sigma_1 - \sigma - \sigma_2 = (\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2$, we have $-d\sigma = 2(\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})d\xi_1$. Thus (A.6) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\sigma_2} \langle \sigma_2 \rangle^{-2b_1} \int_{\sigma_1} \langle \sigma_1 \rangle^{-2c_1} d\sigma_1 \int_{\sigma} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2b}\, d\sigma \\
&\qquad \leq \sup_{\sigma_2} \langle \sigma_2 \rangle^{-2b_1 + [1-2c_1]_+ + [1-2b]_+}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $c_1, b < \frac{1}{2}$, then need $b_1 + c_1 + b \geq 1$.
Subregion $|\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2}| \geq 2|\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2}|$. Then $|\xi| \leq \frac{3}{2}|\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2}|$. Also, $\frac{3}{4}(\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2 \leq (\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 = -\sigma_1 + \sigma + \sigma_2 \leq 3|\sigma_2|$ and hence $(\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2 \leq 4|\sigma_2|$. We change variable $y = (\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2$ to obtain that (A.6) is bounded by

$$\sup_{\sigma_2, \xi_2} \langle \xi_2 \rangle^{1-4b_1} \int_{y=-\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2}^{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2} |y|^{-1/2} \int_{\sigma_1} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2b} \langle \sigma_1 \rangle^{-2c_1}\, d\sigma_1\, dy. \tag{A.7}$$

Since $-\sigma + \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 + (\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2 = \sigma_2 - (\xi_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2 + y$ is fixed, by Lemma A.2,

$$\int_{\sigma_1} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2b} \langle \sigma_1 \rangle^{-2c_1} d\sigma_1 \leq \langle \sigma_2 - (\xi_2 - \tfrac{1}{2})^2 + y \rangle^{-\alpha} \qquad \text{if } b + c_1 > \tfrac{1}{2}$$

with $\alpha = 2b - [1 - 2c_1]_+$ if $c_1 \geq b$ and $\alpha = 2c - [1 - 2b]_+$ if $b \geq c_1$. By Lemma A.1 with $f(y) = \chi_{-\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2 \leq y \leq \langle \xi_2 \rangle^2}(y)|y|^{-1/2}$ and $g(y) = \langle y \rangle^{-\alpha}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\sigma_2} \int_{y=-\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2}^{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2} |y|^{-1/2} \langle \sigma_2 - (\xi_2 - \tfrac{1}{2})^2 + y \rangle^{-\alpha} dy \\
&\qquad \leq \int_{y=-\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2}^{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2} |y|^{-1/2} \langle y \rangle^{-\alpha}\, dy \\
&\qquad \leq \langle \xi_2 \rangle^{[1-2\alpha]_+}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (A.7) is bounded by

$$\sup_{\xi_2} \langle \xi_2 \rangle^{1-4b_1+[1-2\alpha]_+}.$$

We now consider the exponent. If $b, c_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $b + c_1 > \frac{1}{2}$, then $\alpha = -1 + 2b + 2c_1$.
Case 1. $\alpha < \frac{1}{2} \iff b + c_1 < \frac{3}{4}$. Then the exponent is $4 - 4b_1 - 4b - 4c_1$ so we need $b + b_1 + c_1 \geq 1$.
Case 2. $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \iff b + c_1 = \frac{3}{4}$. Here, we need $b_1 > \frac{1}{4}$.
Case 3. $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \iff b + c_1 > \frac{3}{4}$. Here, we need $b_1 \geq \frac{1}{4}$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.1 (b). We show that the proof of Lemma 3.1 (b) is actually identical to that of Lemma 3.1 (a). We discuss only the + case. The estimate is equivalent to showing

$$|W| \leq c \|v\|_2 \|v_1\|_2 \|v_2\|_2$$

where

$$W = \int_* \frac{\hat{v}\hat{v}_1\hat{v}_2|\xi|\langle\xi\rangle^{-1/2}}{\langle\sigma\rangle^c\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{b_1}\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{b_1}} \tag{A.8}$$

with $\hat{v} = \hat{v}(\xi,\tau)$, $\hat{v}_1 = \hat{v}_1(\xi_1,\tau_1)$, $\hat{v}_2(\xi_2,\tau_2)$, $\sigma = \tau + \xi$, $\sigma_1 = \tau_1 + \xi_1^2$, $\sigma_2 = \tau_2 + \xi_2^2$, and $*$ indicates the restriction $\xi = \xi_1 - \xi_2$, $\tau = \tau_1 - \tau_2$. Indeed, for $\hat{v} \in L^2$,

$$\int_{\xi,\tau} [\partial_x(u_1\bar{u}_2)]\widehat{\ }(\xi,\tau)\langle\xi\rangle^{-1/2}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-c}\hat{v}(\xi,\tau)d\xi d\tau$$
$$= \int_{\xi,\tau} |\xi| \left[\int_{\substack{\xi=\xi_1-\xi_2\\ \tau=\tau_1-\tau_2}} \hat{u}_1(\xi_1,\tau_1)\hat{u}_2(\xi_2,\tau_2)\right] \langle\xi\rangle^{-1/2}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-c}\hat{v}(\xi,\tau)d\xi d\tau.$$

Set $\hat{v}_1(\xi_1,\tau_1) = \hat{u}_1(\xi_1,\tau_1)\langle\sigma_1\rangle^{b_1}$, $\hat{v}_2(\xi_2,\tau_2) = \hat{u}_2(\xi_2,\tau_2)\langle\sigma_2\rangle^{b_1}$ to obtain (A.8).

We note that (A.8) is the same as (A.1) considered in the proof of Lemma 3.1 (a) with b, c_1 in (A.1) replaced by c, b_1, respectively. Thus, the condition $b + b_1 + c_1 \geq 1$ in Lemma 3.1 (a) becomes $c + 2b_1 \geq 1$ in Lemma 3.1 (b) ☐

References

[1] Daniella Bekiranov, Takayoshi Ogawa, and Gustavo Ponce, *Weak solvability and well-posedness of a coupled Schrödinger-Korteweg de Vries equation for capillary-gravity wave interactions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1997), no. 10, 2907–2919. MR **MR1403113 (97m:**35238)

[2] Daniella Bekiranov, Takayoshi Ogawa, and Gustavo Ponce, *Interaction equations for short and long dispersive waves*, J. Funct. Anal. **158** (1998), no. 2, 357–388. MR **MR1648479 (99i:**35143)

[3] J. Bourgain and J. Colliander, *On wellposedness of the Zakharov system*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (1996), no. 11, 515–546. MR **MR1405972 (97h:**35206)

[4] J. Bourgain, *Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. I. Schrödinger equations.*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 3 (1993), no. 2, 107–156.

[5] J. Bourgain, *Refinements of Strichartz' inequality and applications to 2D-NLS with critical nonlinearity*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (1998), no. 5, 253–283. MR **MR1616917 (99f:**35184)

[6] M. Christ, J. Colliander, and T. Tao, *Ill-posedness for nonlinear Schrödinger and wave equations*, arxiv.org preprint, `http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0311048`.

[7] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao, *Almost conservation laws and global rough solutions to a nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Math. Res. Lett. **9** (2002), no. 5-6, 659–682. MR **MR1906069 (2003j:**35294)

[8] A.J. Corcho and F. Linares, *Well-posedness for the Schrödinger-Korteweg-de Vries system*, preprint (2005).

[9] L. Glangetas and F. Merle, *Concentration properties of blow-up solutions and instability results for Zakharov equation in dimension two. II*, Comm. Math. Phys. **160** (1994), no. 2, 349–389. MR **MR1262202 (95e:**35196)

[10] J. Ginibre, Y. Tsutsumi, and G. Velo, *On the Cauchy problem for the Zakharov system*, J. Funct. Anal. **151** (1997), no. 2, 384–436. MR **MR1491547 (2000c:**35220)

[11] J. Holmer, *Local ill-posedness for the 1D Zakharov system*, arxiv.org preprint `http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0602153`.

[12] M. Keel and T. Tao, *Endpoint Strichartz estimates*, Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), no. 5, 955–980.

[13] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega, *A bilinear estimate with applications to the KdV equation*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), no. 2, 573–603. MR **MR1329387 (96k:**35159)

[14] ———, *Quadratic forms for the* 1*-D semilinear Schrödinger equation*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **348** (1996), no. 8, 3323–3353. MR **MR1357398 (96j:**35233)

[15] H. Pecher, *Global well-posedness below energy space for the 1-dimensional Zakharov system*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2001), no. 19, 1027–1056. MR **MR1857386 (2002j:**35036)

[16] ———, *Global solutions of the Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system with rough data*, Differential Integral Equations **17** (2004), no. 1-2, 179–214. MR MR2035502

[17] ———, *Global solutions with infinite energy for the one-dimensional Zakharov system*, Electron. J. Differential Equations (2005), No. 41, 18 pp. (electronic). MR MR2135252

[18] ———, *Rough solutions of a Schrödinger-Benjamin-Ono system*, arxiv.org preprint, `http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0511038`.

[19] ———, *The Cauchy problem for a Schrödinger-Korteweg-de Vries system with rough data*, arxiv.org preprint, `http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0501408`.

[20] R. S. Strichartz, *Restrictions of Fourier transforms to quadratic surfaces and decay of solutions of wave equations*, Duke Math. J. **44** (1977), no. 3, 705–714.

[21] N. Tzirakis, *The Cauchy problem for the Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system in low dimensions below the energy space*, Communications in PDE **30** (2005), no. 5-6, 605–641.

University of Toronto

University of California, Berkeley

University of Toronto